

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**July 25, 2006**  
**9am – 12pm**  
**NWIFC**  
**Minutes**

---

**Attendees:**

Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	US F&W, BTSAG Co-chair
Cramer, Darin	DNR, AMPA
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG co-chair
Geppert, Rollie	IAC
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Co-Chair
Martin, Doug	WFPA consultant, CMER co-chair
Mendoza, Chris	ARC, RSAG Tri-Chair
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Price, Dave	WDFW
Schuetz-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Stewart, Greg	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair

**Minutes:** The June minutes were approved.

---

**Report Back From Policy:** Doug, Nancy and Darin are working with Steve McConnell on a budget for DFC reports  
Reported that CMER is reviewing fish passage proposals, and will bring something to Policy next month on fish passage.  
Policy approved the Hardwood Conversion budget changes and asked for more detail to present to the Forest Practices Board for their approval.

---

**ISPR Update:** DNR is working with UW/Vogt on getting contract renewed.

---

**Status Tracker Update:** A few updates were made on the status tracker. The progress report has been received for the Type N BCIF Project.

---

**Report From AMPA:** Darin has determined that 8-10 projects will need project managers. Best option appears to be to hire another full-time project manager. He will be presenting to Policy next week. Expects that project manager cost can be covered for 2007 by leftover 2006 monies and in future will have to plan for about 10% of CMER budget to go to project management, which is a typical ratio.

---

**SAG Requests:**

- LWAG: Shade effectiveness study extension
    - Is there any way to get approval for these sites? Can we go higher in the USFS? Can Policy do anything to help do this?
    - Darin will follow up on attempting to regain sites
    - Mendoza: What are implications to dropping that block from the study?
    - CMER vote: Do we want to continue study? Yes
    - Will send this issue forward to Policy, along with our recommendation and a summary of the consequences for dropping that block on the results
- 
- ISAG: Fish passage flume study request and stream simulation study request
    - Sturhan: Is there consensus within ISAG on these? Price believes so. At least within the “fish passage” subgroup.
    - Heide comments that the study scopes/plans as written don’t adequately address all the comments made. Is it possible for CMER to say “we would like to send to peer review and reserve CMER approval for project?” Sturhan believes that we can do this; the inadequately-addressed comments can go as specific questions to the peer review team. However, there are larger, policy-type questions we should figure out before sending it to peer review.
    - Martin says all his questions/issues could be appropriately framed as questions to the peer review team. Price notes that other comments ARE Policy-type issues that need to be resolved.
    - The scoping papers should be used to ascertain whether these types of studies should be pursued. Don’t need to worry about details of study design yet. Those should wait until we (CMER and Policy) decide that this approach and study are what we want to do. Price suggests submitting overview document that CMER requested last month as the “Scoping” document and rename the two current “Scoping” documents as “Study Designs” and attach as appendices to Policy. Meanwhile, will prepare study designs (and scoping paper) to be sent to peer review, pending Policy approval of scope.
    - Jackson reminds us that the fish passage study proposed does not ask whether or not fish can pass, so that question is not appropriate to ask peer review. That is a question for a different study. We should determine which question we want to address, and ask for RFPs if we want help from outside on how to address that question. Price and Mendoza feel we can

- add it as an additional question for peer reviewers, such as “Is there a better way to find out whether these culverts pass fish?”
- Pleus notes that if we are going to base decisions on peer review responses to technical questions, then CMER needs to approve peer review questions. Mendoza concurs and notes that that is the procedure we decided on in prior studies.
  - It was suggested to add some text regarding this study’s place with regard to WDFW Scope of Work
  - CMER send scoping paper to Policy, with (renamed) study designs as attachments? APPROVED with consensus
  - Send scoping paper and study designs to peer review, contingent upon approval of scoping plan by Policy? APPROVED with consensus
  - Darin reminds CMER representatives to talk with their stakeholder Policy representatives to brief them on the issues of concern with these.
- RSAG: Plot width proposal
    - Policy requested these coarse-level scoping documents
    - Request that the plot width proposal be accepted by CMER and forward to Policy: APPROVED
    - Request that the site class proposal be accepted by CMER and forward to Policy: APPROVED

**SAG Issues and questions from the co-chairs:**

- UPSAG: Nancy: How is UPSAG dealing with work assigned at Policy retreat on groundwater recharge? Ans: UPSAG response to Policy request to address groundwater issue waiting for framing document that was to be written by Heide, Jed, and Miguel. Sturhan notes that a first draft has been written, but has not been completed. Dieu expects that UPSAG will be coming in with a request for money to have someone develop a coarse scoping document that proposes several possibilities along with rough budgets to present to Policy.
- SAGE: Doug: What is going on with Type N Char scoping? Ans: Will discuss Greg’s draft at next SAGE meeting.
- RSAG: Doug: How is riparian photography project going? Ans: Consultant has encountered schedule issues related to receipt of diapositive photos. Martin: need to set a date for workshop, which will be really important for several projects. Can we get a date by next month? Delayed (past September) is okay, but set date.
- BTSAG: Doug: How did cut problem turn out? Ans: Got good response from landowners, and all trees have now been cut and no delay was encountered. Sent letter to all landowners to make sure their cutters know that ALL designated trees must be cut.
- IWM: Nancy: What is status? Ans: Working on potentially integrating N-soft and IWM projects. Had one meeting with Peter Schiess at UW. Small work group has prepared scoping questions, hopefully will have study design by end of

summer. Includes question about unintended [negative] consequences of N buffers due to changes in required road layouts. Schiess' group is developing a proposal to look at this. Mendoza wants to be sure that other aspects of water quality, and even in sediment production, in soft rock type Ns are also addressed, rather than just doing a road study.

---

**Introducing outside science into CMER (Cramer):** There is some guidance in the Adaptive Mgmt board manual, but not much. Ken Miller plans August 17 small subgroup of Policy to deal with this subject. CMER doesn't feel that it is necessary to do anything with such papers. These science papers are and should be incorporated by reference in studies we are doing, and can be used on the ground to support a proposed alternate plan, but it doesn't seem like there is anything we need to do formally here at CMER. Policy has asked SAGS to report (1) are any current studies addressing these issues?, and (2) were SAG members aware of this research when designing their current studies? Nancy will send around an e-mail with these questions for the SAG's to answer.

---

**CMER Staff Report:** These are available for people to see. If a SAG has a need for CMER staff help, contact Darin and/or bring a request to a CMER meeting.

---

**CMER Monthly Report to Policy:**

- Shade effectiveness site issues with USFS
  - Fish passage scoping request for review by Policy
  - Plot width and Site Class scoping docs
  - update that UPSAG is working on scoping groundwater recharge issues
- 

**Agenda items for August:**

- How to bring in external science.
  - RSAG BCIF status, implemenation, and strategy should be discussed at CMER before RSAG proceeds with more work.
- 

**Science topic for August:** WetSAG presenting wetland mapping project

---

**Other:** Pete Peterson notes that more and more science emerging that predicts climate change effects will soon be overwhelming other (such as timber harvest) effects. We may want to start considering this in our studies

No science session for the July meeting.